

will remove roadblocks that can prevent surviving spouses and former spouses from getting the benefits they are entitled to from both private sector pension plans and Federal retirement programs.

Beyond women's equity, we also dealt with the issue of pension portability. We have a very significant problem in this country that exists every time someone wants to leave their job to go to another job. Pension portability is almost as serious a problem as health care portability. We need to find ways with which our workers can take pensions with them and keep increasing retirement savings without obstacles or cutbacks as they move from one job to the next. This bill will expand the PBGC's missing participant program to help ensure that retirees who have lost touch with their former employer never find their benefits unexpectedly forfeited when the pension plan terminates. It will also make it easier for new employees to enter their employers' 401k plan immediately, rather than waiting to benefit.

Finally, there are a number of issues relating directly to pension security that have to be addressed. Security for pensions is something that increases in urgency for workers as they get closer to that date when they will retire. There is a pervasive sense of insecurity about pensions in retirement today. Working people, men and women, are very concerned about whether or not they will have the capacity to deal with the problems that they know they will confront with regard to their own income viability, their own ability to ensure some confidence that they will have the necessary means to live in some security and comfort during retirement. The way that we are going to be able to address that effectively is to put the kind of priority and attention on pension security that it deserves. We took an important step yesterday by increasing the guaranteed benefit provided to retirees from multiemployer pension plans that become insolvent.

Several months ago, we laid out our desire to see an action agenda addressed. That action agenda has four components. The first was personal security and the need to ensure that people are safe in their neighborhoods. The second was paycheck security and the real desire that working people have to earn more income. The third was health security. And the fourth is pension security.

Madam President, we are now at a point where we have been able to address all four of those security questions. We have been able to protect the cops on the beat program. We have made a downpayment in providing better personal security out on the street than we had before. Yesterday, we passed the minimum wage bill.

We are working on both sides of the aisle, hopefully, to resolve our differences in the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation. I hope we can, at some

point, put that bill back before the Senate in an effort to resolve what remaining differences there are, in an effort to move it forward and to have a Presidential signature and, at long last, declare our victory with regard to the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill.

Health insurance portability is something we all ought to support, and, in fact, have supported. The Kennedy-Kassebaum bill passed by a vote of 100 to 0. There is no reason whatever that we cannot finish that legislation this month. I hope we can continue to keep our eye on the ball. Our eye on the ball in this case is clearly portability for health insurance.

All the other issues, as important as they may be, can be resolved, as well. But the important issue, the one matter that unites us all, is the need to have that portability. We ought to use this legislation to get that job done.

Now, finally, pension portability and pension security—it is critical we get that legislation passed. I am hopeful with the action taken yesterday that will happen.

This is part of a larger agenda the Democrats have laid out, having three components—security, which I have addressed, opportunity, and responsibility. We will have a lot more to say about those three components in the weeks and months ahead. I know that we are now prepared to go to the pending matter. For that, I yield the floor.  
(Mr. DEWINE assumed the chair.)

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have now completed the process that was laboriously worked out to take up and consider the small business tax relief package, the House-passed package that included minimum wage and some tax considerations. Then we added to it the Finance Committee's work and the managers' bill. We completed that whole process yesterday, and we have now taken up and considered amendments to the TEAM Act. We have passed the TEAM Act.

In connection with all of that, earlier, we had caught up in that maze the taxpayers bill of rights II. I tried yesterday to clear that for unanimous consent because I believe there is overwhelming support for the taxpayers bill of rights bill. I know one of the principal architects of that legislation is Senator PRYOR from Arkansas. But there was objection heard to it because I understood maybe there were amendments that were being considered to be offered to that bill. I understand now that maybe that is not true. I know that Senator PRYOR, Senator FORD, and I think maybe Senator GRASSLEY, and others, are working to see if we can get agreement on that. That is something that we clearly should do to give the American people some further rights with regard to how they are dealt with by the Internal Revenue Service. That is something we should do, and it is long overdue. But there was objection.

Now, today, also caught up in the small business tax relief, minimum wage, TEAM Act, and gas tax act was another matter commonly referred to as the White House Travel Office. So I wish to seek unanimous consent that we could get that legislation taken up and acted on because, once again, it is clearly something that involves equity for the people involved. I thought that once we got all these other issues dealt with, this would be something we could move.

So I am going to continue to try to move bills that are pending before the Senate. Some have been pending for a long time. It is my intent to try to clear for a unanimous consent agreement the bill dealing with the Gaming Commission, which is not something I am particularly excited about, but there is a lot of interest in it, again, on this side from Senator LUGAR and Senator COATS of Indiana. I know that Senator SIMON is interested in that. My intent is to try to get it up and have it considered and deal with it, vote it up or down, but stop holding things up.

I am trying to develop a pattern here of moving legislation, certainly legislation that is not controversial, such as the taxpayers bill of rights, the White House Travel Office, and the Gaming Commission—although that could get to be controversial. If I find out that there will be a lot of amendments beyond what were agreed to in the committee, after consultation with the Democratic leader, we might decide not to bring that up if we are going to have protracted debate on that. We have work we need to do, such as the Department of Defense appropriations bill. The two managers are here and are ready to go. We need to get on with that. If we are going to have objections, then I guess we will not be able to proceed.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2937

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 380, H.R. 2937, relating to the White House Travel Office. This provides for the reimbursement of attorney's fees and costs incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that office on May 19, 1993; further, that a substitute amendment, which is at the desk, offered by Senator HATCH, be offered and agreed to, the bill be deemed read the third time and passed, as amended, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. We have not seen this amendment, to my knowledge. I do not know that anyone has shared it with us. I have not seen it. But I say that, beyond the issue of the Hatch amendment, there are Members